UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/927,015 | 08/09/2001 | Andrew R. Golding | 10984-601001 | 4152 |

26161 7590 06/17/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LY, ANH | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2172 | 4 |

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/927,015 | GOLDING, ANDREW R. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Anh Ly | 2172 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,16-23 and 26-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 16-23 and 26-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's Amendment filed on 04/29/2004.

2. Claims 9-15 and 24-25 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 8 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,950,195 issued to Stockwell et al. (hereinafter Stockwell) in view of US Patent No. 6,275,820 issued to Navin-Chandra et al. (hereinafter Navin-Chandra).

. With respect to claim 1, Stockwell discloses enumerating plausible queries of a target database using query generation rules (queries are generated based on the set of rules, where each rule includes a plurality of rule parameters and value associated with rule parameters and the queries are stored in the database on the server connecting to the Internet: col. 3, lines 25-30 and lines 35-50; also see abstract).

Stockwell discloses generation query by using a set of rules and matching rules and the queries are stored in the database on the server in the Internet network and searching the query based on the rules from the database server and result of the query list (col. 8, lines 1-30) and using query matching rule to get the best match query: col. 7, lines 15-67). Stockwell does not explicitly teach generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries.

However, Nanvin-Chandra teaches content of each hit or result as a contextual summarization of search hits (abstract, col. col. 2, lines 50-67 and col. 4, lines 8-30 and see figs. 2A, 2B and 2C).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Stockwell with the teachings of Nanvin-Chandra so as to obtain the summaries of query from the searching the database from a search engine. The motivation being reducing the time, saving effort and time to produce query result summaries.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

6. Claims 2-7, 16-23 and 26-27are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,950,195 issued to Stockwell et al. (hereinafter

Stockwell) in view of US Patent No. 6,275,820 issued to Navin-Chandra et al. (hereinafter Navin-Chandra) and further in view of US Patent No. 5,918,225 issued to White et al. (hereinafter White).

With respect to claims 2-3, Stockwell in view of Navin-Chandra discloses a method as discussed in claim 1.

Stockwell discloses generation query by using a set of rules and matching rules and the queries are stored in the database on the server in the Internet network and searching the query based on the rules from the database server and result of the query list (col. 8, lines 1-30) and using query matching rule to get the best match query: col. 7, lines 15-67). Stockwell does not explicitly teach generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries. Nanvin-Chandra teaches content of each hit or result as a contextual summarization of search hits (abstract, col. col. 2, lines 50-67 and col. 4, lines 8-30 and see figs. 2A, 2B and 2C). In combination, Stockwell and Nanvin-Chandra do not teach a lookup table.

However, White discloses searching the queries based on the lookup table (see figs. 6A-6C and col. 49, lines 60-67, col. 50, lines 1-16 and col. 52, lines 41-48; also see abstract) and displaying the result on the screen display device (col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 20-28 and col. 7, lines 47-65).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Stockwell in view of Nanvin-Chandra with the teachings of White so as to obtain the queries from the lookup table (col. 49, lines 60-67 and col. 50, lines 1-16), the summaries of query from the searching

database from a search engine. The motivation being reducing the time, saving effort and time to produce query result summaries and for enhancing the speed of retrieving the information, the database server maintain one or more database indexes in the client/server environment.

With respect to claims 4-7, Stockwell teaches wherein the query generation rules 2 are domain specific; wherein the query matching rules 2 are domain specific and wherein generating further comprises conflict resolution rules (col. 3, lines 18-50 and col. 7, lines 35-67 and col. 8, lines 1-35); and wherein the target database resides on a server connected to the Internet (col. 1, lines 40-67).

With respect to claim 16, Stockwell discloses pre-processing a target database; receiving a user query for the target database; and returning an associated teaser if the user query matches 7 one of the selected queries (col. 11, lines 25-28, also see col. 7, lines 45-55).

Stockwell discloses generation query by using a set of rules and matching rules and the queries are stored in the database on the server in the Internet network and searching the query based on the rules from the database server and result of the query list (col. 8, lines 1-30) and using query matching rule to get the best match query: col. 7, lines 15-67). Stockwell does not explicitly teach generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries. Nanvin-Chandra teaches content of each hit or result as a contextual summarization of search hits (abstract, col. col. 2, lines 50-67 and col. 4, lines 8-30 and see figs. 2A, 2B and 2C). In combination, Stockwell and Nanvin-Chandra

do not teach building a mapping from selected queries to associated 4 teasers for the target database.

However, White discloses searching the queries based on the lookup table (see figs. 6A-6C and col. 49, lines 60-67, col. 50, lines 1-16 and col. 52, lines 41-48; also see abstract) and displaying the result on the screen display device (col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 20-28 and col. 7, lines 47-65).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Stockwell in view of Nanvin-Chandra with the teachings of White so as to obtain the queries from the lookup table (col. 49, lines 60-67 and col. 50, lines 1-16), the summaries of query from the searching database from a search engine. The motivation being reducing the time, saving effort and time to produce query result summaries and for enhancing the speed of retrieving the information, the database server maintain one or more database indexes in the client/server environment.

With respect to claim 17, Stockwell discloses identifying selected queries in conjunction with query generation rules; and generating an associated teaser for each of the selected queries in conjunction with query-matching rules (queries are generated based on the set of rules, where each rule includes a plurality of rule parameters and value associated with rule parameters and the queries are stored in the database on the server connecting to the Internet: col. 3, lines 25-30 and lines 35-50; also see abstract and using query matching rule to get the best match query: col. 7, lines 15-67).

With respect to claims 18-23, Stockwell in view of Nanvin-Chandra discloses a method as discussed in claim 16.

Stockwell discloses generation query by using a set of rules and matching rules and the queries are stored in the database on the server in the Internet network and searching the query based on the rules from the database server and result of the query list (col. 8, lines 1-30) and using query matching rule to get the best match query: col. 7, lines 15-67). Stockwell does not explicitly teach generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries. Nanvin-Chandra teaches content of each hit or result as a contextual summarization of search hits (abstract, col. col. 2, lines 50-67 and col. 4, lines 8-30 and see figs. 2A, 2B and 2C). In combination, Stockwell and Nanvin-Chandra do not teach building a mapping from the queries to their associated teasers; wherein building the mapping comprises storing the queries and associated teasers in a hash table; wherein building the mapping comprises storing the queries and associated teasers in a cache; and wherein building the mapping comprises storing the queries and associated teasers in a trie data structure.

However, White discloses the creation of mapping for page operations (col. 24, lines 18-30); hash table (col. 26, lines 17-25); a cache (col. col. 17, lines 51-67) and trie data structure (col. 7, lines 46-65).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Stockwell in view of Nanvin-Chandra with the teachings of White so as to obtain the queries from the lookup table (col. 49, lines 60-67 and col. 50, lines 1-16), the summaries of query from the searching

[redacted] database from a search engine. The motivation being reducing the time, saving effort and time to produce query result summaries and for enhancing the speed of retrieving the information, the database server maintain one or more database indexes in the client/server environment.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (display the associated to the user: displaying the result on the screen display device - col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 20-28 and col. 7, lines 47-65), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

**Contact Information**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is 703 306-4527 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on 703 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 746-7239.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-6606 or 703 305-3900.

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY
JUN. 9th, 2004